

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12-14, 17-19, 22-26, and 29-35 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishikawa (US 6,323,902).

Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Ishikawa. Claim 1 sets forth a device for mounting a camera relative to a portable computer, including a base adhered to the rear portion of the portable computer and a camera holder removably connected to the base by cooperating first and second mating members.

Ishikawa is directed to a notebook-type personal computer which includes a camera attachable to the side wall of a display unit of the computer. The camera 30 of Ishikawa includes a base portion 32, and a mounting mechanism 60 for removably mounting the base portion on the display unit 14 of the computer. See Ishikawa, col. 3, lines 50-53, col. 4, lines 35-37, and FIG. 2A. Thus, the base portion of Ishikawa is integral to the camera, so that the camera/base portion as one unit is removably attached to the display unit via the mounting mechanism. The camera is not removably connected to the base portion.

In contrast to Ishikawa, the device set forth in claim 1 of the present application includes a base which is separate from the camera. The base is adhered to the rear portion of the computer, and a camera holder is removably connected to the base for mounting the camera relative to the computer. Accordingly, claim 1 of the present application is believed to be patentable over Ishikawa. Claims 2-9 and 12-14 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-9 and 11-14 are also believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 29 is a method claim corresponding to claim 1, wherein the method includes adhering a base to a portion of the computer and removably engaging a second mating member of the camera holder to a first mating member of the base. Thus, in contrast to Ishikawa, the base set forth in claim 29 is separate from the camera.

Accordingly, claim 29 is believed to be patentable over Ishikawa. Claims 30-35 depend from claim 29, and therefore, are believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency on claim 29.

Claims 10-11, 15-16, 20, 21, and 27-28 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner has indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, new claim 36 has been added which incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 10 into claim 1, and claim 10 has been cancelled. Claim 11 has been amended to depend on claim 36, and new claims 37-47 have been added which also depend on claim 36. Accordingly, new claim 36 is believed to be patentable over the prior art. Amended claim 11 and new claims 37-47 are believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency on new claim 36.

New claim 48 has been added which incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 15 and all of the limitations of the intervening claims into claim 1, and claim 15 has been cancelled. Claim 16 has been amended to depend on new claim 48. Accordingly, new claim 48 is believed to be patentable over the prior art. Amended claim 16 is believed to be patentable at least due to its dependency on new claim 48.

Claims 17 and 26 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 20 and 27, respectively. Claims 20 and 27 have been cancelled, and claim 21 has been amended to depend on amended claim 17. Accordingly, amended claims 17 and 26 are believed to be patentable over the cited art. Claims 18-19 and 21-25 depend on amended claim 17, and therefore, are believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency on amended claim 17. Claim 28 depends on amended claim 20, and therefore, is believed to be patentable at least due to its dependency on amended claim 20.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call to attend to these matters.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,


Pamela R. Crocker
Pamela R. Crocker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 42,447

PRC:cjm
Telephone: (585) 477-0553
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646